UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HENRY L. HARRIS,

Plaintiff(s),

V.

ORDER DENYING SUMMARY
JOHN E. POTTER, U.S.

Postmaster General,

Defendant(s).

2.4

Having reviewed the extensive record submitted by both sides and following oral argument, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant's motion for summary judgment is DENIED. The court finds that there are too many disputed issues of material facts and too many questions about the reliability of the record to warrant the granting of summary judgment. For example, the record is confused about whether the Human Resources department had an overtime budget during the relevant time; and if it did, how and to whom any of those overtime funds were distributed; whether plaintiff's

department follows a practice or policy of offering extra hours first to workers outside of that department to find non-overtime workers before incurring overtime and assigning those extra hours to Training and Development employees; whether Mr. Ward was working overtime when he was assigned to Training and Development; whether Human Resources or Mr. Ward's department, Transportation and Networks ("Transportation") paid his salary while he was training; whether Mr. Ward was being paid overtime by his department, Transportation, so he could work on a non-overtime basis in plaintiff's department; and whether plaintiff's overtime eligibility is subject to rules which govern Motor Vehicle Craft employees throughout defendant's facility or is subject to the overtime budget of his department.

That said, the court is not satisfied that the best way of addressing these issues is by having a full trial on the merits. Accordingly, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16, 42(b), 43(e) and 56(d), IT IS ORDERED as follows:

- 1. The trial presently scheduled for **June 12, 2006** is **VACATED**.
- 2. An evidentiary hearing is scheduled for June 12, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom G, 15th Floor, Federal Building, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102.
- 3. The hearing will be limited to the resolution of the following issues:

When in 2003 defendant allowed Mr. Ward to work in plaintiff's department and when defendant did not allow

///

///

plaintiff to sign the Transportation department's overtime lists and did not give plaintiff overtime work even when plaintiff did sign those lists, as plaintiff claims:

- a. Did plaintiff experience an adverse employment action; and
- b. Did defendant have legitimate non-retaliatory
 reasons for denying plaintiff overtime work in 2003?
 Once the court resolves these issues, the court will
 schedule further trial proceedings as necessary.
- 4. For purposes of the evidentiary hearing only, the burden of presenting evidence will be placed on defendant initially. Plaintiff's ultimate burden of persuading the court by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant retaliated against him is unchanged.
- 5. By May 17, 2006 defendant shall comply with all aspects of this court's pretrial scheduling order dated September 23, 2005 and order amending the scheduling order dated February 2, 2006, insofar as the issues discussed in paragraph 3 are concerned.
- 6. If plaintiff wishes to lodge additional exhibits with respect to the issues discussed in paragraph 3, he may do so by May 22, 2006.
- 7. The pretrial conference presently scheduled for June 6, 2006 is VACATED and in its stead, a pre-hearing conference is scheduled for June 6, 2006 at 4:00 p.m. in Courtroom G, ///

1	15th Floor, Federal Building, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San
2	Francisco, California 94102.
3	Dated: May 11, 2006
4	Demand Jimmeman
5	Bernard/Zimmerman United States Magistrate Judge
6	
7	G:\BZALL\-BZCASES\HARRIS\DENY.SUM.JUDGMT.ORD.2.wpd
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	